

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)				X
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)			X	
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Items V-1,2,5,6:

A records search conducted by the North Central Information Center found that several cultural resources are located approximately one mile west of the project site. The remains of several cabins and a wood rail log chute, remnants of timber activities in the latter 1800's, are situated along a branch of the Martis Creek drainage. In this same area, an isolated basalt flake and an area of lithic scatter have been identified. Although these resources are not in the vicinity of the project site, there may be undiscovered resources on the site that could be unearthed during development activities. The following standard condition will be included for the project:

"If any archeological artifacts, exotic rock (on-native) or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a certified archeologist retained to evaluate the deposit in consultation with the Washoe Tribe. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archeological find(s). If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Corner, Native American Heritage Commission and the Washoe Tribe must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.

Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements, which provide protection of the site, and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site."

No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item V-3:

No unique paleontological resource or geologic features have been identified on the site.

Discussion- Item V-4:

There have been no unique ethnic cultural values associated or identified with the mountain lodge project site.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X

2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)		X		
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)		X		
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)		X		
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)		X		
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)		X		
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)		X		
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)		X		

Discussion- Items VI-1,4:

The proposed project consists of the construction of an approximately 16,00 square foot building with approximately 10,500 square foot deck, approximately 7,800 linear feet of trench (for water, fire supply, electric line, sewer, natural gas, and communication), and relocation of approximately 7,000 square feet of 500 series access road. According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on a majority of soils classified as Umpa stony sandy loam, Jorge Tahoma complex, and Jorge very stony sandy loam. There are several other soil types also in the area but in much smaller percentages. The Soil Surveys did not identify any unique geologic or physical features for any of the soil types. Construction of a mountain lodge and utility trenching improvements will not create any unstable earth conditions or change any geologic substructure. Therefore, there is no impact

Discussion- Items VI-2,3:

The project will disturb approximately 2 acres of area and will move approximately 3,508 cubic yards of soil on site (approximately 1,822 cubic yards will be imported). All ground disturbing activities will be conducted in accordance with the Lahontan Region Project Guidelines for Erosion Control. The grading that will occur will include cuts of up to approximately 5 feet and fills of up to approximately 19.5 feet (within foundation walls). The project's site specific impacts associated with soil disruptions and topography changes can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items VI-2,3:

MM VI.1 The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on and off site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed

by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.

Any Building Permits associated with this project shall not be issued until, at a minimum, the Improvement Plans are approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department.

Prior to the County's final acceptance of the project's improvements, submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department two copies of the Record Drawings in digital format (on compact disc or other acceptable media) in accordance with the latest version of the Placer County Digital Plan and Map Standards along with two blackline hardcopies (black print on bond paper) and two PDF copies. The digital format is to allow integration with Placer County's Geographic Information System (GIS). The final approved blackline hardcopy Record Drawings will be the official document of record.

MM VI.2 The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the ESD concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical)

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department.

The applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

MM VI.3 Staging Areas: The Improvement Plan(s) shall identify the stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.

MM VI.4 Prior to Improvement Plan approval, submit Proof of Contract with a State licensed contractor if blasting is required for the installation of site improvements. The developer shall comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and use only State licensed contractors to conduct these operations.

Discussion- Items VI-5, 6:

The disruption of the soil discussed in Items 2 and 3 above increases the risk of erosion and creates a potential for contamination of storm runoff with disturbed sediment or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. In addition, this soil disruption has the potential to modify the existing on site drainageways by transporting erosion from the disturbed area into local drainageways. Discharge of concentrated runoff after construction could also contribute to these impacts in the long-term. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present and occur when soils are disturbed and protective vegetative cover is removed. The project would increase the potential for erosion impacts without appropriate mitigation measures. The project's site specific impacts associated with erosion can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items VI-5,6:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

Refer to text in MM VI.3

MM VI.5 Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs), shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the ESD).

Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Straw Wattles, Hydroseeding (EC-4), Silt Fence (SE-1), Construction Fencing, Diversion Dikes, Gravel Bags, and revegetation techniques.

MM VI.6 Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall obtain a State Regional Water Quality Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater quality permit and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees.

MM VI.7 There shall be no grading or other disturbance of ground between October 15 of any year and May 1 of the following year, unless a Variance has been granted by the RWQCB and the Placer County ESD.

MM VI.8 No grading operations shall occur under saturated soil conditions.

MM VI.9 Truck routes are to be located across existing logging roads.

MM VI.10 Existing drainage patterns shall not be significantly modified.

MM VI.11 Drainage swales disturbed by construction activities shall be stabilized by appropriate soil stabilization measures to prevent erosion.

MM VI.12 All non-construction areas shall be protected by fencing or other means to prevent unnecessary disturbance.

MM VI.13 During construction, temporary gravel, straw bale, earthen, or sandbag dikes and/or nonwoven filter fabric fence shall be used as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials from the site during periods of precipitation or runoff.

MM VI.14 Revegetated areas shall be continually maintained in order to assure adequate growth and root development. Erosion control facilities shall be installed with a routine maintenance and inspection program to provide continued integrity of erosion control facilities.

Discussion- Items VI-7,8,9:

The proposed project consists of the construction of an approximately 16,00 square foot building with approximately 10,500 square foot deck, approximately 7,800 linear feet of trench (for water, fire supply, electric line, sewer, natural gas, and communication), and relocation of approximately 7,000 square feet of 500 series access road. Based on soil reports for projects in the area, the project site is considered moderately to highly stable and free from ground failures. According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on soil with slopes identified as greater than 8 percent. The soils are also identified to have a moderate potential for expansive soils. Compliance with the CBC/UBC will require all project elements to be designed to withstand seismic forces and any potential expansive soils. The project's site specific impacts associated with geologic hazards or the creation of substantial risks to life or property based on expansive soils can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items VI-7,8,9:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

MM VI.15 The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:

- A) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable);
- B) Grading practices;
- C) Erosion/winterization;
- D) Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)
- E) Slope stability

Once approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems that, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report shall be required, prior to approval of the Improvement Plans. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (APCD)			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (APCD)			X	

Discussion- All Items:

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions would result from on-site fuel combustion for space and water heating, fireplaces/stoves; and off site emissions at utility providers associated with the project's electricity and water demands.

The project would result in minor grading and the construction of a lodge. The lodge is proposed to be built as a "LEED Certified" building. The construction and operational related GHG emissions resulting from the project would not substantially hinder the State's ability to attain the goals identified in AB 32 (i.e., reduction of statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; approximately a 30 percent reduction from projected 2020 emissions). Thus, the construction and operation of the project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)			X	

4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)			X	
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Item VIII-1:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to the standard handling and storage requirements. The project does not propose to use or store hazardous materials. Accordingly, impacts related to the handling, transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, are considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-2:

Construction of the proposed project would involve the short-term use and storage of hazardous materials typically associated with grading, such as fuel and other substances. All materials would be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws including Cal-OSHA requirements and manufacturer's instructions. Therefore, the risk of accident or upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

It does not appear that there are any "sensitive receptors" (i.e. school) within one quarter mile of the project site. In addition, the project does not propose a use that typically would involve any activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and as a result will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6:

The proposed project is not within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the project area.

Discussion- Item VIII-7:

Site development activities will include the removal of vegetation on the project site and the thinning of vegetation around the site, reducing the effect of wildland fires. In addition, the project will be required to provide for fire flows for the protection of the structure and occupants of the structure.

Discussion- Item VIII-8:

Mosquito breeding is not expected to significantly impact this project. Common problems associated with over watering of landscaping and residential irrigation have the potential to breed mosquitoes. As a condition of this project, it is recommended that drip irrigation be used for landscaping areas. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-9:

The project will not expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)			X	
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)		X		
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)		X		
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)		X		
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)				X
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)		X		

Discussion- Item IX-1:

The project will utilize the Northstar-at-Tahoe Comstock water well installed in accordance through permits obtained from Placer County Environmental Health Services (PCEHS). The water well is drilled in excess of 100-feet below ground surface and is protected from contaminants at the ground surface by a sanitary seal and an annular seal. This impact is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-2:

The project currently has an existing well drilled. The existing well meets the County standard for providing adequate water supply for the proposed project. The project lies in a hardrock fractured water supply. It is impossible to quantify how much water will be yielded from a fractured water supply or how long any water well will be sustained. The proposed project is a low use as compared to an industrial use or an agricultural use. Thus, the

potential to deplete the groundwater supply is considered to be less than significant in this case. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

The proposed project consists of the construction of an approximately 16,00 square foot building with approximately 10,500 square foot deck, approximately 7,800 linear feet of trench (for water, fire supply, electric line, sewer, natural gas, and communication), and relocation of approximately 7,000 square feet of 500 series access road. A preliminary drainage report was prepared for the proposed project. The project site is located on a ridgeline between the peaks of Lookout Mountain and Mt. Pluto. Being located at a ridgeline, the site straddles two large watershed basins. All drainage in the vicinity of the project's area is by sheet flow, which is interrupted by downed timber, forest debris, and rock outcroppings with most if not all of the runoff being infiltrated into the soil before it reaches channelized flow. Based on the size of the watersheds involved and the relatively small changes to be expected in the watersheds, the post project watersheds are generally consistent with the pre project drainage patterns. The proposed construction will not significantly alter the drainage patterns of the site. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-4:

The proposed project consists of the construction of an approximately 16,00 square foot building with approximately 10,500 square foot deck, approximately 7,800 linear feet of trench (for water, fire supply, electric line, sewer, natural gas, and communication), and relocation of approximately 7,000 square feet of 500 series access road. A preliminary drainage report was prepared for the proposed project. The project is located on a ridgeline between two watersheds. The western watershed is approximately 181 acres, of which only approximately 1 acre (or 0.6 percent) is influenced by the project. The eastern watershed is approximately 381 acres, of which approximately 1.1 acres (or 0.3 percent) is influenced by the project. Approximately 30 percent of the project site (approximately 22,000 square feet) will be covered by impervious surfaces. The project proposes dripline trenches that will infiltrate stormwater runoff from the proposed impervious surfaces. The project proposes a revegetation and stabilization plan that will limit runoff to small quantities or reduce any increases in runoff back to existing levels. The project's site specific impacts associated with increases in the surface runoff can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Item IX-4:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

MM IX.1 The limited Improvement Plan submittal shall include a limited drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing and proposed conditions, the downstream effects of the proposed improvements, and a Best Management Practices (BMP) Plan to provide temporary and permanent water quality protection.

Discussion- Items IX-5,6:

The construction of the proposed improvements has the potential to degrade water quality. Stormwater runoff naturally contains numerous constituents; however, urbanization and urban activities including development and redevelopment typically increase constituent concentrations to levels that potentially impact water quality. Pollutants associated with stormwater include (but are not limited to) sediment, nutrients, etc. The proposed development has the potential to result in the generation of new dry-weather runoff containing said pollutants and also has the potential to increase the concentration and/or total load of said pollutants in wet weather stormwater runoff. The proposed project's impacts associated with water quality can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items IX-5,6:

Refer to text in MM VI.1 to MM VI.3

Refer to text in MM VI.5 to MM VI.14

MM IX.2 Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the ESD).

BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Revegetation, Infiltration Trenches (TC-10), etc. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance.

Discussion- Item IX-7:

This project is not likely to otherwise degrade groundwater quality

Discussion- Items IX-8,9,10:

The project construction is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows would be redirected after construction of the improvements. The project improvements are not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-11:

This project is not likely to change the direction or rate of flow of groundwater. The project lies in a hardrock subsurface which is also known as a hardrock fractured water supply. Due to the nature of a hardrock water supply, it is very difficult to ascertain the longevity and sustainability of any water well located with this subsurface condition. In this case, the project proponent is proposing using the Northstar-at-Tahoe Comstock water well for each of the proposed project. The well which has been drilled meets the PCEHS standard for a public water system. Given the hardrock fractured water supply and the location the well, the likelihood of altering the rate or direction of flow is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required

Discussion- Item IX-12:

As discussed in Items 5 and 6 above, the project has the potential to increase water quality impacts to local drainageways, and therefore, local watersheds. The proposed project is located within the Martis Creek watershed. The proposed project's impacts associated with impacts to surface water quality can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Item IX-12:

Refer to text in MM VI.1 to MM VI.3

Refer to text in MM VI.5 to MM VI.14

Refer to text in MM IX.1 to MM IX.2

X. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)			X	
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X

5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)			X	
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item X-1:

The proposed project involves the development of a lodge facility, and the installation of associated infrastructure improvements, on the slopes of an established ski resort. The project will not physically divide an established community.

Discussion- Item X-2:

The project site is designated as Tourist/Resort Commercial in the Martis Valley Community Plan and Forestry 160 acres minimum (FOR-B-X-160 ac. min.) by the County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use is consistent with the Community Plan policies as well as the Zoning Ordinance standards.

Discussion- Item X-3:

The project site is subject to the provisions of Article 12.20 Tree Preservation in Area East of Sierra Summit and is subject to the requirements indicated in this tree preservation zone. The applicant will be required to implement this ordinance as applicable to prevent significant impacts prior to project development. As discussed in Section IV (Biological Resources), the project proposes to mitigate for tree impacts through either an on-site replanting plan or through the payment of mitigation fees based on tree diameters.

In addition, the project site is not located within any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved Habitat Plan Area. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item X-4:

The proposed construction of a lodge facility on the site is not inconsistent with site zoning and the land use designation of the Community Plan; the lands surrounding this site are developed with ski and snowboard trails and lifts that are accessory to the ski resort. The proposed project will be compatible with the adjacent uses.

Discussion- Item X-5:

There is no timber harvest plan in place, or timber operations proposed, for the project site, or areas in the immediate vicinity of the project site. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-6:

The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

Discussion- Item IX-7:

The proposed project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land uses for the project area. The site is currently undeveloped and the proposed project is consistent with the County plans for this site.

Discussion- Item IX-8:

The proposed project will not cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment, such as urban decay or deterioration.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XI-1:

The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state as the project area does not contain known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Discussion- Item XI-2:

The Martis Valley Community Plan does not delineate the project site as a source of any locally-important mineral resources. The development of the site will not result in a loss of availability of such resources.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)			X	
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)				X
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)			X	
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items XII-1,2:

The project site is situated on a ridgeline in the Northstar-at-Tahoe ski resort, near the terminus of the Zephyr Mountain lift. The most significant existing sources of noise in this vicinity include the noise from chairlift operations and the noise from skiers and snowboarders; the nearest sensitive receptors are located at the Ritz-Carlton resort, approximately 0.9 miles downslope from the site. The Martis Valley Community Plan establishes a maximum outdoor noise level of 60dB. The daily operations of a restaurant, cafeteria and lounge will not exceed this standard and will not result in any substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XII-3:

Construction of the proposed project will create a temporary increase in ambient noise levels, which could exceed Ordinance standards. However, because there are no sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity, the following condition of approval will allow construction activities to take place during daylight hours.

- Construction hours will be allowed from sunrise to sunset, except on Sundays and Federal Holidays.
- A temporary sign (4' x 4') shall be located on the project site depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said sign shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations.

These conditions will be included on the Improvement Plans.

Essentially, quiet activities, which do not involve heavy equipment or machinery, may occur at other times.

Work occurring within an enclosed building may occur at other times.

The Planning Director is authorized to waive the time frames based on special circumstances, such as adverse weather conditions.

Discussion- Item XII-4:

The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Discussion- Item XII-5:

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XIII-1:

The proposed project is the development of a day lodge facility to provide services to skiers at a ski resort. The construction of the lodge and the installation of the necessary infrastructure will not induce population growth.

Discussion- Item XIII-2:

The proposed project is a commercial development and will not displace housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (ESD, PLN)				X
2. Sheriff protection? (ESD, PLN)				X
3. Schools? (ESD, PLN)				X

4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (ESD, PLN)				X
5. Other governmental services? (ESD, PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The proposed project will result in additional demand for fire protection services as provided by the Northstar Fire District. However, this additional demand will not result in the provision of new or physically altered government service or facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts.

Discussion- Items XIV-2,3,4,5:

The Placer County Sheriff's Department provides police protection services to the project area. No new roads will be constructed as a result of this project and the project will have no effect on local schools. As the proposed project is consistent with the underlying land use designations, the project's development will result in negligible additional demand on the need for police services. As is required for all new projects, "Will Serve" letters will need to be provided from the Sheriff's Department. The incremental increase in demand for police protection services will not result in new or physically altered governmental services that would cause significant impacts.

XV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed Mountain Lodge is a restaurant and cafeteria facility that will provide a variety of guest services to day skiers at the resort. The construction and operation of this facility will have no effect on existing recreational facilities in the area and no new facilities will need to be constructed as a result of the development of this project.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)		X		
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				X

4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, public transit, pedestrian facilities, etc.) or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items XVI-1,2:

The proposed project consists of the construction of an approximately 16,00 square foot building with approximately 10,500 square foot deck, approximately 7,800 linear feet of trench (for water, fire supply, electric line, sewer, natural gas, and communication), and relocation of approximately 7,000 square feet of 500 series access road. Although there will be no direct automobile (wheeled vehicle) access to the site, the proposed project will generate approximately 11 new Northstar employees. The project is intended to serve the existing skiers at Northstar. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area's transportation system. With the project traffic added to the existing traffic volumes, all area roadway segments and intersections will continue to operate within acceptable LOS standards. For potential cumulative traffic impacts, the Placer County General Plan includes a fully funded Capital Improvement Program, which with payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements, will help reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed project's impacts associated with increases in traffic can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items XVI-1,2:

MM XVI.1 Prior to issuance of any Building Permits, this project shall be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Tahoe), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) shall be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW:

A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code

The current total combined estimated fee is \$24,999.15 (based on trips associated with 11 new employees). The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete.

Discussion- Item XVI-3:

The project proposes no roadways for public access and the project of constructing a mountain lodge for skiers and associated utilities within a ski resort does not create incompatible uses. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-4:

The proposed project does not impact the access to any nearby use or impact emergency access. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-5:

The proposed project is providing parking spaces in accordance with County approvals. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-6:

The proposed project does not create any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists since there are no public pedestrian or public bicycle facilities within the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

45

Discussion- Item XVI-7:

The proposed project will not conflict with any existing policies or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-8:

The proposed project will not air traffic patterns in the vicinity.

XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)			X	
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)			X	
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)				X
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)				X
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)			X	
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)			X	

Discussion- Items XVII-1,2,6:

The proposed project will be provided sewer service from the Northstar Community Services District. The Northstar Community Services District has provided comments regarding the project and has identified that there is capacity for the proposed project in the sewer system. The comments did not identify any significant sewer issues for the proposed project. The sewer district will be required to grant their approval prior to Improvement Plan approval and Building Permit issuance. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-3:

This project will be served by a public utility district and will not require the construction of new on-site sewage systems.

Discussion- Item XVII-4:

The proposed project consists of the construction of an approximately 16,00 square foot building with approximately 10,500 square foot deck, approximately 7,800 linear feet of trench (for water, fire supply, electric line, sewer, natural gas, and communication), and relocation of approximately 7,000 square feet of 500 series access road. There are no new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing drainage facilities that are proposed or required. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVII-5:

The project currently has an existing water wells drilled by permit through Placer County Environmental Health Services. There is sufficient water available to serve this project as the existing well meets the minimum standards

set for the by PCEHS for water supply. Thus, the concern about whether this parcel has sufficient water available for this project is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-7:

The project will be served by the Eastern Regional Materials Recovery Facility. This facility has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. No mitigation measures are necessary.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Services Division, Melanie Jackson, Chairperson
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Phillip A. Frantz
 Department of Public Works, Transportation
 Environmental Health Services, Justin Hansen
 Air Pollution Control District, Angel Rinker
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher
 Environmental Engineering Division, Janelle Heinzler
 Northstar Fire District, Mark Shadowens

Signature Michael Wells Date April 22, 2011
 Michael Wells, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Department	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Mosquito Abatement District	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____